Dear Paul, 9/12/74

Yesterday Jim phoned me and asked for your folks' Shepherdstown address. He told me he had just received a letter from you that I would not like and did not want to discuss it by phone. I gave him the address and phone and as you can see I am not writing you there. Nor do I ever expect to be writing you again.

However, there is the kind of I-didn't-neither-have-my hand-in-the-cookie-jar phoney reasoning and self-justification in your delayed letter of the 4th, to which Jim was unable to respond, that I will not permit to go unanswered. Nor will I fail to let you know what to expect if it is within my capability and you have any kind of an article that appears on this any where and under any circumstances until we have had a full opportunity to attempt to exploit the subsidiary rights.

You have had a closed mind on this because your sick ego is out of control. Suddenly you are to yourself some kind of unique genius with capabilities, visions and understandings possessed by no other. Again this superman stuff what difference can mere fact make? You were from the first, despite your promise before we went into the litigation, to try to make some kind of public name for yourself in this and you have twisted, distorted, broken confidence, lied and contorted your alleged thought and contrived belief into conformity with this preconception and pre-determination.

There is nothing I have told you about this that is not factual. I have not exaggerated, not lied, only you were determined to pay no attention if it suited you to pay no attention and what it did not suit you to believe simply wasn't so. That you wanted it to be so is sufficient for your super-intellect and an arrogance I find it impossible to begin to describe.

We have actually rushed with this as you can't imagine. I have not corrected typographical errors, one on the cover, not to delay it. I told you from practical experience to ignore Jim's estimate because he was without basis for it. Events have proven me correct. This is where I have lifetime experience that predate your first diapering. I have had recent experience, repeatedly. Those things I feared did come to pass and Jim is fully aware of them. The latest is that the printer has to junk 2/7 of what he had printed and that is not the first development to guarantee him a loss on this. He also had to shoot all the negatives over. These are the kinds of things that do happen. They did happen. What the hell was I to do when you paid no attention to anything and simply made a nuisance, a persistent nuisance out of yourself in order to tell yourself that you would be something less that an unprecedented bastard in doing what you had made up your mind to do anyway.

You had no right to make any agreement with Jim involving me without my approval. I was consulted on and I agreed to merely one: that he would write you, not I. I hold you fully responsible for anything and everything that I regard as damaging and if you know what is good for your egocentric arrogant self you'll hit the phone and call back every one of those four submissions you made. I'm not going to take the time to explain, you having made any effort to explain a futility because you simply disregard what you don't want to hear. Now I've more than had it with wasting a large part of my time cleaning up messes other great intellects and superegos like you who are utterly lacking in either practical understanding or practical experience at the very best. Without knowing of this really sick self-justification you have written I had already addressed this with Jim as it relates to other matters.

I will not spare you an indication of the kind of rotten bastard your combination of uncontrolled ego and terrible arrogance really makes of you. Jim borrowed 100% of the large sum of money to pay the printer. You are jeopardizing that and it is to begin with completely unethical. You have no word to say in this utterly dishonest record you have contrived to mask your intent to be unethical. I did explain subsidiary rights to you in detail and there was no exaggeration in it, as Jim knows. Either of two I have been working on has the capability of returning to the bank what Jim is daily paying interest on. He was with me on one day before yesterday. You are such a sick rotten scoundrel who is determined in this matter and just refuses to believe what he doesn't want to that I forbid him to tell you what it is. You are in my opinion now out of control and I will henceforth trust you with nothing, as I will do what I can to hold you

to account for any breach of confidence under any circumstances. You may regard this as idle but you never believe what you don't want to anyway.

Have you no concept of ethics, man? We go to all this considerable trouble to sue, have steps open to use, go to all the trouble to get a book read and all that means and you like a less than common crook come along with all these manufactures that you can twist in your mind to justify common indecency and a breach of your own initial word before we filed any suit that you would stay out?

You'll do worse than this but I canot keep going on this kind of thing because nothing means anything to you except the personification of all that is bad in a Prussian mind. You know, you alone. You are honest, you alone. Everyone else is a liar, you alone have principle to go with this exceptional understanding.

I was so open with you I phoned and invited you to share. If you think I am stingy about sharing, ask Jim if there was a single haggle over what he wanted and if in fact I didn't offer more.

There is, despite your sick concepts, no single thing I have done on this wthout consultations, never less than Jim. In order to keep it up while you were jerking your mind off out there Jim paid Howard's busfare to come here and I kept him, broke as I am, and Howard declined pay. There was no delay, you miserable wretch, except in the fabrications you need to tell yourself that you are other than an utterly unscrupulous monster. Jim will tell you that I koot ready for any momentarily expected call from the printer, that I was working on subsidiary rights before I had a complete copy to show and in fact, one of the more important didn't have a complete copy of proofs until day before yesterday. I dealt with one by phone and with another by showing selections from an incomplete xerox. If this last one alone comes to pass yours will be kid stuff it all succeed. If the one to which I have to send a bood when we have it goes for it, it will reach more people than all you can combined and it will pay off Jim's borrowings.

There is no such things as arranging subsidiary rights in 10- days and you were not only without warrant in assuming September 11, which is now past, but it was without my sanction, and while I do nothing without consultation and agreement I do control this; and worse, you were told why it couldn't be. Nobody, Jim or anyone else, had any right to give you any date. You had no right to go off like some common nightmeak after the completely honest explanations I gave you. not one of which was in any sense even slightly exaggerated. But you won't face this because you would then have to face yous really miserable behavior in all of this, behavior that can be justified if not by intent to be crooked and self-seeking only as sick. You won't because those who need it never do but you should look into this.

As a matter of fact and as a matter if law, if Jim ever reached any such agreement as you represent it is invalid. I was not consulted on it, and you both had everything I wrote on it and there is nothing in anything I wrote not exactly opposite it.

Boy are you unique. You are now the expert on Watergate and this new coverup. Is there no limit to your soaring ego? Is nothing beyond your concept if it suggests that you are not the repository of either the best accumulation of fact or the world's finest intelligence?

You ever twist Jim's effort to avoid offending you when your letters made clear that you heeded nothing. If he went no farthur than "passing on his concern" your emph. to anyone except a deliberate crook that was enough. It was also more than taking the edge off, your words, as you very well know and as I've explained above.

If he makes his feelings known to you after four submissions, are they even enough for him to use as a substitute for toilet paper? ("now is the time to make your feelings known to me.") In the letter that begins "I intended to make sure that any publication would be held off for 10 days or until September 11."

You scoundrel, how on Semptember 4, not the date of delivery, September 11," Name

"make sure that any publication would be held off for 10 days, or until September 11."

An honest man of honest intent does not make this kind of dishonest representations in writing. If he has honest intent he determines in advance, not the kind of really dirty stuff you have done.

And you ask for a legal opinion of the rights of this after you make four submissions?

Naturally you would not take anything on faith from me because you had made a record of refusing to believe that which is beyond question, because you persisted in intrusions and naggings that served only to give you a basis for stealing and for doing tricks to please your ego. Have you the slightest idea how many hours I spent trying to get around your contrivances and preconceptions before I said I'd respond no further? Have you for all your exalted representations of your great knowledge of publishing and the problems that in your mind don't exist, any concept of the great amount of work it requires? Or the other work that had to be done simultaneously so that your ilk can sit back in the comforts of your lives and be somebody because others do all this other work of which you have no concept?

Naturally you can't take anything on faith when you have already on your own and by refusing to believe anything made four submissions, after a detailed explanation of the norms and the realities and the costs and the needs. To say nothing of what is now clearly so far outside you, simple ethics.

I told Jim to give you his opinion but no details of what I've been working on. He knows enough. He was in on the last meeting. If you were really genuine about this you'd never have made submissions and then asked later maybe can it be so? It is one of the shabbier dodges in a letter vile with them. What the hell good will it do for you to NOW "pay attention to them" after you have done all the harm it is within your power to do?

If it is "most probable that nobody will want this article," a deliberate lie, why the hell make this issue? What not pay a little attention to all you were told. Bastard, you want a little cheap fame (other than what without stint we gave you and not on your request.)

I can imagine to whom you've talked if "everyone out here to whom I have talked thinks I am wasting my time by trying to maintain any kind of relationship with someone who is so far out." I note that when I suggested to you that you do some checking with those who would feed you something other than your intended feedback you refused. People who know this business, not those who know nothing and would be the creatures of your representation, whatever it may be. But Jim will tell you that to the end, because I don't think that by nature you are the kind of nuisance, ego-sick skunk you have made yourself in this, I arranged my last letter to give you all the provocation you might want to break off with me, saving your face for you. And a self-respect that nothing in this whole rotten affair justifies.

Ignorant or liar, whichever you are, the question is anything but what you pose, "the total amount of attention given to your book."

So you follow with a manufacture, "It is all too clear that Harold will have to have someone to blame if he doesn't get the attention this transcripts deserves." You write that to the right one. He was there when I rejected major attention because the conditions were unacceptable.

On fact you are false from beginning to end. Not that you didn't speak to him when you said, not that kind of fact. On your representation of the situation and the realities. So far as the result is concerned, whether this is because you are sick or crooked or yearn for attention (that I turn down regularly when it serves no constructive purpose) is not really material. Two things are: intent and potential. In both you are in this as utterly unscrupulous as it is possible for anyone to be.

There is also a question of judgement involved in this, oh master of melonry, or seer of the secht ploy, oh comprehender of the executive sessions (ho, hum; a bunch of old ladies at a kaffee klatch." If perfection is not a state of man, you can get whatever Jim's assessment may be on mine, often when I was entirely alone and sometimes

when I think he will tell you he disagreed with me. Ask him what the record shows.

And while you are at it, because of all this drek you let come out of your wrong end, get another assessment to see how this self-justifying nonsense stacks. Ask him what happened in the Spectro case, who first spotted it , who insisted on it, and whether he ever heard a single word of criticism from me to Bud on what has to be one of the most endless fuckups of all time. What you have decided has to be the truth about me so you can be a real bastard and tell yourself you are a great benefactor of mankind if your invention. It is not the fact.

The transcript can make countless stories. There is no question of that. Nor is that the question before us, the question on which your record and integrity are hanging. You don't even put that honestly.

You ignore what I suppose even you could not bring yourself to twist enough to address, why we feel we have to make personal sacrifices in the interest of what is before the Congress now. You were told enough. It was true, But the crook in you simply willed it into falsehood so you could ignore it. Ask Jim. Ask him with whom I first consulted, but he is not to give you name or identification, merely an estimate of the significance of this. Ask him what we have done with the Nader people, you of all these infallible instincts and perfections in knowledge and the aid they will for the first time give in trying to effect some Congressional attention.

We do these things, you monster who makes lies up to make himself an angel and all others villains.

We have broken our backs in court, invested so many thousands of hours in these efforts with no income and usually with expenses not repaid, and you make up these slanders so you can tell yourself that you are not unspeakably unprincipled?

Have you the remotest notions of how a single good article can be misused to fuck up a really good thing? Do you suppose that I also could not have written an article and tried to sell it? Why the hell do you think I didn't? Because I am rich and don't need the money? Or maybe it is because of all this attention you think I want?

I've been staying out of this between you and Jim because you were unreasonable, because I was working while you were jerking off in the mind and because there was too much to do and your blindness was beyond coping with. But this time I'm not to this extent: If I have no proof that he has given you this I'll send you a copy. You will disregard it because you have this whole structure about yourself built up, But between you and me for this unconscionable thing you have done there will be this record. If you had reached into Jim's pocket and stolen $6,000 that would be less dishonest. He may not speak to you of this but I do!

There are also other aspects. What happens to a controversial book is always an uncertainty. I have had too much experience not to be aware of it. But as I told you to begin with, it is not a matter for anyone to mess into. We have already paved too many roads to hell.

You are entirely out of your depth in this. It is all beyond your experience. But your self-concept and your lust for attention so carefully hidden hold you captive.

Do you think we are unaware of the Ford situation? Do you think you have a minute fraction of what we have? Why then have we done nothing publicly? The situation is political, timing is of the essence, not just something with Paul Hoch's name on it that tries to say in a few words what cannot be said as it has to be on something of this magnitude.

Jim will also tell you that twice recently when he asked me if I could not write a magazine piece on something of interest to us I didn't say I could but I should not. Is this what you mean by this alleged pen I have for attention? Legally and politically I believe the article would be wrong so broke as I am I would not do it.

Paul, I sorrow for you. You were once a decent, respectable man. There is no common whore who is without more principle than you have displayed in this, not with out more honesty. You may or may not have done us and what we are all supposed to want serious harm but you have been as disreputable as any one can be, as unethical and as self-deceptive. Thus I do, really, sorrow for you to have grown so far from the fine young man I once knew and respected.